

**REMARKS**

**I. Election/Restrictions**

In the office action dated November 28, 2007, the Examiner indicated that the above referenced application is subject to a restriction. The Examiner argued that the application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Species 1: Species of FIG. 1

Species 2: Species of FIG. 5

The Examiner argued that the species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. The Examiner did identify such mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. Applicant notes that FIG. 1 and FIG. 5 are similar to one another in that FIG. 1 illustrates a block diagram 100 comparing output rendering from an LPS system with LCDS versus an improved imaging model applied to an LCDS imaging data stream, in accordance with an embodiment. In general, embodiments are directed toward methods and systems utilized in printer output devices (e.g., photocopy devices, laser printers, etc.) for improving color-imaging rendering through an imaging data stream. FIG. 5 illustrates output from an LPS system with LCDS, including text and fill thereof, versus output from an improved imaging model applied to an imaging data stream, in accordance with an alternative embodiment. FIG. 5 depicts a block diagram 500, which includes blocks 502 and 506 and respective fills 504 and 508. On an LPS system with LCDS, the result would appear similar to that of block 502, while on a CLCDS system (i.e., in forms, text is imaged after fills), the result would appear similar to that of block 506. Thus

**U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/648,968**

both FIG. 1 and FIG. 5 illustrate LPS and LCDS systems, with CLCDS being a variant of the LCDS. Both FIGS. 1 and FIG. 5 discuss the use of imaging models with respect to imaging data streams. In this regard, it is not clear from the Examiner's explanation, which aspects of FIGS. 1 and 5 are mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. Applicant believes this is probably the case because FIGS. 1 and 5 do not illustrate separate species but merely different embodiments of the same overall concept. The Applicant is unable to identify claims encompassing separate species and requests that the Examiner provide more information and an explanation of why the Examiner believes FIGS. 1 and 5 constitute separate species and which aspects are mutually exclusive. The Examiner should also identify which claims constitute separate species. Without this information, the Applicant submits that that FIGS. 1 and 5 are not patentably distinct from each other.

In order to comply with the restriction requirement, Applicant believes that Examiner is arguing that claim 4 may relate to FIG. 5 and the other claims relate to FIG. 1, but without further identification from the Examiner, the Applicant is unable to make a full determination if this is what the Examiner is stating. Applicant therefore elects with traverse to continue prosecution of claims 1-3 and 5-20 as these likely relate to FIG. 1, and claim 4 likely relates to FIG. 5. The Examiner should clarify which specific claims relate to which specific figure, if the Applicant is to make a proper election. To this end, claim 4 has been cancelled as relating to FIG. 5. Applicant notes, however, that the characteristics of claim 4 may not actually relate to that shown in FIG. 5, because as far as Applicant can discern, FIGS. 1 and 5 do not relate to different species for the reasons provide above, and because the Examiner has not identified which specific features in FIGS. 1 and 5 are mutually exclusive and which claims relate to which figure. It seems that FIGS. 1 and 5 are thus not mutually exclusive and do not constitute different species. Applicant requests that the Examiner provide further information to assist in properly determining which aspects of Applicant's claims relate to different species.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing discussion, the Applicant has responded to each and every rejection of the Official Action. The Applicant has elected with traverse to continue prosecution of claims 1-3 and 5-20 and has cancelled claim 4. The Examiner's restriction requirement did not point out which claims relate to which aspects of FIGS. 1 and 5 and further which aspects of Applicant's claims are mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. The Examiner merely made a statement that the species are independent or distinct and that claims to the different species recite mutually exclusive characteristics of such species without specifically noting these characteristics. Also, it appears that FIGS. 1 and 5 represent merely alternative embodiments of the same overall concept.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned representative to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: January 24, 2008

---

Kermit Lopez  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 41,953  
ORTIZ & LOPEZ, PLLC  
P.O. Box 4484  
Albuquerque, NM 87196-4484  
Tel. (505) 314-1312